1: Lee H-5 (no date) 1949 EE1 Bulgaria EE1
Yugoslavia

After becoming premier in October, 1919, Stambolisky's first task was that of signing the peace terms drawn up by the victorious Allies.

The Treaty of Neuilly, November 27, 1919, reduced Bulgaria to a smaller area than it had held before the First Balkan War of 1912 and imposed new burdens. Bulgaria lost the Aegean coast (Western Thrace) to Greece, southern Dobruja to Romania, and strips of land on the west to Yugoslavia. The army was limited to a total of 20,000. Reparations amounting to $450,000,000 were to be paid in thirty-seven years, beginning in 1921. The existence of Bulgarian minorities in all the neighboring states furnished a basis for revisionism which steadily grew, particularly after the rise of fascism throughout Europe in the thirties.[2] The provision for an exchange of populations with Greece greatly heightened the volume of refugees who streamed into Bulgaria, adding to the political ferment and economic burdens of the country. In these and other ways, the settlement exacerbated conditions under which radicalism throve.

Stambolisky won a commanding position in the parliamentary elections of March, 1920, and proceeded to ride roughshod over both the middle class and conservative parties on the right and the Communists on the left. He instituted a number of reforms, including a land law designed to break up the crown lands and larger estates, the imposition of a heavy income tax, and the establishment of a compulsory labor service which in the first four years of operation secured the equivalent of five million wage days of work for the Ministries of Public Works and Railways. In foreign policy he sought to fulfill the treaties and to effect a reconciliation with Yugoslavia among whose Communist and Agrarian parties his concepts of Slavic federation found support. His dictatorial methods, however, won him enemies on all sides, not least among them being the Macedonians who opposed his policy of rapprochement with Yugoslavia. In June, 1923, he was overthrown by a *coup d'état* organized by a group of intellectuals, led by Professor Tsankov, and the League of Army Reserve Officers, among whom Colonels Velchev and Georgiev were leaders. A few days later Stambolisky was assassinated.

Following the Stambolisky regime, the Tsankov government (1923-26) represented a swing to the right. "Communist" insurrections and violence were suppressed with great severity. The increased activity of the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (IMRO) caused difficulties at home and abroad, although after the assassination of its leader Alexandrov (1924) it was split into two factions under Protoguerov and Mihailov who became bitter rivals. A threat of war with Greece arose, but was averted by the action of the League of Nations. A more conciliatory government

[2] See G. P. Genov, *Bulgaria and the Treaty of Neuilly* (Sofia, 1935).

2: Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EE1 Bulgaria EE1

CHAPTER II

THE HOUSE BECOMES A HOME

ALTHOUGH I had been studying Bulgarian peasant life for three years before concentrating upon Dragalevtsy, I never ceased to marvel at the home life of these people. Their quiet, satisfied way of taking their marriage partners for granted, the manner in which they treated their children, and the brief courting days of the young invariably fascinated me. Therefore, I started at the beginning to learn.

"How do you build a house?" I asked, eager to check my observations with their frequently droll explanations of why they did as they did.

The seriousness with which the peasants replied showed that building a house, although it cost only five or six hundred dollars, was a tremendously important undertaking to the Dragalevtsy family. The "new house" was discussed for a year or two in advance by the members, who also consulted kinsmen and neighbors before eventually deciding as to the type of dwelling desired. Before they could begin any construction the villagers had to get a permit from the Department of Engineering in Sofia, which sent out an engineer to "draw up the line" and to offer the choice of two or three plans. The government in requiring this permission sought to do away with the long, unhygienic, old-style type of home which the peasant would traditionally build. The fee for the services of the engineer was about a dollar and a half.

The family members next began to gather the materials. They piled up wagonloads of stone, and purchased sand, lumber, brick, and tiles before they called in the master builder *(maistor)* from outside to tell him what kind of house they wanted and to agree verbally about details. If all the materials had been gathered ahead of time,

2:Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EE1 Bulgaria EE1

was also conflict over the location of boundary stones. At first I could scarcely believe my eyes when I was shown how the peasants distinguished their fields. Taking some landmark such as a tree, a bend in the road, or a stream, the peasants marked off their strips by small piles of stone. Fences and hedgerows were impracticable because the strips were too small to justify the expense of enclosure. Since every farmer possessed several strips, possibilities of conflict over the boundaries were numerous. The wonder is that there was so little trouble, in view of the fact that every foot of the strip must be utilized if the farmer was to make any profit.

Animals too proved a source of dispute. The oxen, for instance, strayed into an unprotected field and did considerable damage to the growing crop. The person incurring loss often took the matter to the mayor for trial in his magistrate's court. Once an effort was made to have all funds collected from such disputes turned over to the local *Chitalishte*, or Library Association, but this received little public support. For some time there was very bad feeling between the shepherds and the dairymen over the question of pasturage. The *Obshtina*, or local government, passed an ordinance that grazing should be done on one's own land and the common pasture abolished. The shepherds, accustomed to roaming over a considerable area in a day's time, were violently opposed to the new measure; those possessing five or six head of cattle naturally favored it.

Other types of conflict also arose over animals. The widow Zdravka, in explaining to me why she was not on good terms with her neighbor Dimiter, brought another case of disagreement over livestock to my attention:

"Just before St. Peter's Day, Dimiter's dogs fell upon my sow as she passed his yard on her way home from pasture. The pig, which was to bear young the next day, became frightened and fell into a ditch. I immediately went to the veterinarian who told me that the pig's young would be stillborn, and sure enough, they were. I went to the priest and the mayor to ask for justice, but Dimiter told them that he didn't let his dogs out and the accident wasn't his fault. Since he was a man, nothing was done to him and I can't do anything about it myself."

2: Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EE1 Bulgaria EE1

CHAPTER IX

THE NATIONAL STATE AS INTRUDER AND REFORMER

In Dragalevtsy, as in agricultural villages throughout the world, the national state was building up a loyalty in competition with the unquestioned loyalty people used to give to their family group and their community. The spread of the government-sponsored school, though its scientific teachings were elementary, weakened the hold of the formalistic, institutionalized religion which went along with a familistic society. Because of the school there was increased conflict between the older and younger generations.

Not only in time of war but also in time of peace the national government had been calling its young men to leave their plows and their cattle to take up pick or rifle. The *trudovatsi* handled the picks, and those in military training the rifles.

After the first World War Bulgaria initiated an ambitious program of compulsory labor as a substitute for military training, formerly required. The original plan called for service from both young men and young women. Recruiting of women later ceased for they proved unsuited to the system. The young men of the country were enrolled in labor camps where they performed their *trudova* (compulsory labor). Each young *trudovak* was required to serve eight months, though for two thousand leva, or less than $25, he could buy himself off at the end of six months. Some young men paid a total ranging from 9,000 leva to 32,000 leva, according to their economic status, to be entirely exempted from service.

The *trudovatsi* built many highways and bridges, and worked without pay in government shops, factories, and lumber plants. Their achievements were significant although much of this potential man power was unused or misused because of the lack of sufficient engineers to give proper direction to the work.

2:Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EE1 Bulgaria EE1

466
656
702

The *trudova* system existed in principle until Bulgaria joined the Axis, though, she like all countries defeated in the first World War, passed through a period when compulsory labor was gradually replaced by compulsory military service. After the *coup d'état* of May, 1934, various groups of army officers controlled many of the country's policies; so it was not surprising to learn of the strengthening of the military forces of the nation. One sign of the government's changed policy was the fact that in 1935 not a single young man from Dragalevtsy went as a *trudovak*, but sixteen were called to do military service. Those eligible for service were called before a commission of army officers and examined; the successful ones passed on to receive military training, and the rest were returned home. Those who were rejected lost some standing in the eyes of the villagers, because it was thought that they had inherited some family weakness. The *family* rather than the individual was blamed.

[559]
[596]

[156]

There was undeniably a great influence exercised upon the village by the practice of taking young men, in their impressionable years, away from the village for an interval of several months. They lived in an army barracks or a *trudovak* camp with other young men from different parts of the country. For a time they ceased doing some things which the village thought essential, and they learned to do other things which older family members would perhaps have frowned upon. They went out from a family system where each member worked more or less as a part of the whole; they returned often very conscious of their own individuality, and had to pass through a process of reconditioning before the early customs, habits, and patterns of thought once more closed about them. There were some individuals who never again fell completely into line and who turned to Sofia for employment and a more congenial atmosphere.

[554]

Older men who returned to the village as retired noncommissioned officers enjoyed a certain prestige that lingered after brass buttons and clumping boots had been exchanged for the conventional village attire. On the wall of the office of the Village Clerk, the names of all local officials and public employees were posted. There was considerable information regarding each man, but the concluding and perhaps most important item was the statement of the person's service

2: Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EEl Bulgaria EEl

to the State, either as a soldier or a *trudovak*. All had served in one of these capacities, else they would not have been employed.

The young men were the only ones called to leave the village. As for the rest of the people, the national government went to them in the persons of its civil servants, who comprised most of the intelligentsia. Even the priest was a government employee, since the state supported the church. The doctor received most of her salary from public funds, since private practice in a village would have been financially unrewarding. In addition to these, the veterinarian, the schoolteachers, and an occasional lecturer from outside formed the advance guard of the national State. All of these public servants knew that they would be held accountable by their supervisors or inspectors, and identified themselves much more readily with the national bureaucracy than with the peasants whom they were supposed to help. Of these, the mayor was the spearhead in the attack on the old ways. One of his duties was to preside over the village court, where he stood for the law and order of the land.

One day as I was leaving the office of the mayor he asked me to stay and attend court. I sat in the corner of the room next to a bookcase jammed with documents. The mayor sat behind his desk, covered on such occasions by the white, green, and red Bulgarian flag, on which there was a stack of folders, one for each case to be heard. On the wall over his head were pictures of the King and Queen, a beautifully colored coat of arms of Bulgaria, and a patriotic calendar. Through the window I could see the small memorial garden in which forty-four fruit trees had been planted in memory of the forty-four local sons killed in the battles of Bulgaria's several wars. Two rifles for use when the policemen were on patrol stood in the gun rack not far from the desk. A bench lined another wall close to the small cast-iron stove. Near me there was a hat rack, and a spittoon less popular than the floor. A muddy, unshaven policeman stood at the door to bark people in and out.

The first man to come in was Iliya Trunin, a thirty-two year old villager in a *kozhuh* (sheepskin coat), who was being sued by Ivan Katsarov, a tavern keeper. Iliya, instead of going to the expense of running an electric line from the main electric cable, had arranged

2:Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EEl Bulgaria EEl

656

What other things did the village government do for the people of the village? The *Obshtina* saw that pure water was piped to the different neighborhood fountains. In addition, the *Obshtina* had the only telephone in the village, which anyone might use upon the payment of two leva. It also had a fire pump, which, so far as could be learned, had never yet been put to work in an emergency.

656
T47

The national government encouraged its village representatives to set up organizations to promote specific activities. One of these was the Red Cross, to which a score of adults, most of them of the intelligentsia or official group, had paid membership fees. The village doctor was one of the leading spirits in this association, though the mayor, having been connected with the Red Cross in Sofia, was also interested. Its activities did not get under way until after 1937, with the exception of the placing of a few posters and a drive for members. The more active Junior Red Cross, headed by the school director, stimulated the interest of children in first aid and good health practices.

A second organization was a local branch of the Union for the Protection of Children, organized by the mayor, who was also its president. Its chief activity was the serving of hot lunches to all school children who did not go home for lunch. This applied to rich and poor children alike, because the wealthier parents were often away from home and thus unable to provide a hot meal for their children. Sometimes as many as eighty of the children received their meals in the *trapezariya* (dining room). The adult members of this association or Union were also for the most part from the intelligentsia and the official groups. This hot-lunch movement had spread throughout Bulgaria into hundreds of schools. Many times it was financed outright by the government; oftentimes by private groups aided by government subsidy. This association, with the support of the *Obshtina*, distributed food to the poorest families of the village at Christmas time. For instance, the officers gave two pounds of sugar, two pounds of rice, and two pounds of meat to each of 120 families at the Christmas season. The pride and independence of the peasants was demonstrated by the fact that no families came to ask for these gifts, because no family wanted to admit it was poor enough to require them. However, those in charge of the distribution were

2: Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EE1 Bulgaria EE1

well acquainted with the economic situation of the villagers and distributed the food accordingly. There was an annual meeting of the Dragalevtsy Union to hear the reports of the retiring officers and to hold the election of new officers. The basis for membership was payment of the annual fee. In other words, it was purely philanthropic, in that the members expected to get nothing in return. I was not surprised to find the names of but very few farmers on the membership list. Peasants did not yet understand organized philanthropy, though individually they might be unusually generous on occasion.

Another group in the village was known as the Association of the Decoration for Valor. In 1935 the mayor got together all of the men who had been decorated for bravery during time of war. A Sofia major talked to them and persuaded them to form a local association, after pointing out that no harm could come and that possibly some advantages might follow, such as price reductions at State baths, special rates for traveling on the railroad, and pension legislation through collective lobbying. At the time I studied the group three or four meetings had been held with unusual group harmony. There was an initiation fee of twelve leva, and an annual fee of twenty leva per member. The membership totaled twenty-eight, which showed Dragalevtsy's reputation for bravery in war. I obtained facts about the organization not only from the officers, but also from interviews with fifteen different members. The reasons given for joining were varied:

1. "To have pensions."

2. "We who have decorations are to get help from the State by working together better."

3. "The privileges of free baths, freedom from school tax, reductions on the railroad, free medicine."

4. "We were ordered to form the local association from Sofia."

5. "Said I would get an iron cross. I wrote down my name but I don't know why."

Some conflict had sprung up between the village veterans with decorations and those who received no decorations but still thought they should have been allowed to enter the association and obtain the same privileges as the others. Many association members felt the same because some friend was in this predicament. The situation became

2:Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EEl Bulgaria EEl

759 school) training and worked for two years in a lying-in hospital. The midwife, who had difficulty in winning the co-operation of the old *babi*, could not set a charge for her services but had to take only what the women gave. The State paid the midwife the equivalent of $16 each month. There was a health committee, composed of the doctor as chairman, the priest, the director of the local school and the mayor. The midwife attended unofficially. This committee met once a month to consider the problems of village hygiene and sanitation and tried to enlist public support for the doctor. The county doctor came twice a year without advance warning to visit the village doctor for the purpose of seeing if her reports were made out properly, if she exercised suitable control of the merchandise, and if she gave the school children proper supervision.

544 Another impact, of an educational sort, upon the traditional way of life was the *Naroden Universitet*, or People's University. This consisted of a series of lectures in the schoolhouse on such topics as these:

1. "Our National Awakeners: A Patriotic Talk"—by a local schoolteacher.
2. "Problems and Purposes of the Zadruga"—by the local president of this agricultural group.
3. "The Insurance of Cattle"—by a veterinarian from Sofia.
4. "Alcohol and Effects"—by a medical man from Sofia.
5. "What Village Homes and Food Should Be Like"—by a different medical man from Sofia.
6. "Concerning Faith"—by a priest from Sofia.
7. "Concerning Tuberculosis"—by the local doctor.
8. "The Cleaning of Seed"—by the district *agronom*.
9. "The Significance and Service of the Producers' Cooperatives"—by a former attorney and by the Superintendent of Cooperatives of the Bulgarian Agricultural Bank.

The mayor encouraged the peasants to attend in the hope that they would be inspired to improve their living conditions or become more loyal to the government.

871 Another educational group affected by the intrusion of the State
● 656 was the school board. Formerly the peasants themselves controlled the board's membership, but it had become an ex officio body composed

2; Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EEl Bulgaria EEl

almost entirely of the intelligentsia. The peasants no longer had much to say about the employment of teachers, or what or how they taught. They and their children accepted what the national government, through its local representatives, provided for them. They took it or left it, but mostly took it.

The national government, along with its other activities, maintained a close connection with the national church. Before the liberation of Bulgaria, the practice arose of having three or five members act as a church board in each village. Even if there happened to be no church building, this group was elected to see about the construction of one. Such a board followed the familistic practice of expecting elders to manage local affairs. After the growth of the national state the board was continued, but subjected to outside control. In Dragalevtsy it consisted of five people: the priest (who was the president), a treasurer, and three other village men who acted as a control committee to audit the work of the old board which they succeeded at the end of its two-year term. In the past the biennial election was held on a Sunday morning immediately after church. But the government took care to see that only those men who had the right to vote *politically* were eligible to elect the church board from a list of candidates prepared by the priest. As the priest prepared his slate with the help of the older people in the village, his choices usually met with the approval of the majority of men.

A candidate had to be an Orthodox Christian by baptism, should never have been in a lawsuit, should not be a drunkard, thief, and the like, nor an atheist opposed to the church. The elections had to be approved by the Sofia Metropolitan, or the high church court, thus removing the authority still further from the village. An office of an elective nature such as this carried a great deal of honor with it. The duties of the office were not burdensome because the church possessed no lands to be administered. Traditionally the church board was supposed to aid in enforcement of Sabbath observance, but members were not particularly zealous in carrying out this obligation. The priest had been having trouble of late with one board member who had become such a tippler that the board's prestige was suffering. If some question needed to be decided, as was the case about five or six times

2:Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EE1 Bulgaria EE1

CONCLUSION

571 178 The concept "social contact" implies both the possibility of contact as well as psychic interaction.[11] The quantitative measurements of this study deal chiefly with the possibilities which the peasants have or create for social interaction, since these were sufficiently clear-cut for the village officials and peasants to measure. But when it came to the more intangible element of psychic interaction I had to rely on direct personal observation. Therefore, the following conclusions are based in part on statistics and in part upon observation:

369 571 178 1. Proximity to a "city-culture" and frequent trips to the city on the part of the villagers does not necessarily mean psychological contact with that "city-culture." For the most part, the peasant moves in a peasant world even while in the city. It is quite natural for him to attach himself to the familiar.

2. Proximity to the city may in itself be a deterrent to the ready acceptance of "city ways" on the part of the villager, since he constantly confronts fashions, habits, and viewpoints which clash decidedly with his own. This leads me to wonder whether or not "modernization," granting that it is desirable, might not come more quickly through a small, provincial town which is more in keeping with rural thought and life than through direct contact with the city. The hikers who visit Dragalevtsy, although causing dissatisfaction, make the mature peasant more resistant to city influences; these visitors do seem to have an influence upon the young; but it would be hazardous to guess to what degree, because so often the seemingly liberal young people become conservative when they have children of their own.

● 656 369 571 178 3. Government leaders in their attempt to raise the peasants' standard of living visit the village systematically for lectures and some demonstrations. They seem to be overlooking the fact that thousands of peasants regularly visit the city where, if some Peasant Center could be established, methods of improved living could be interpreted in a favorable light. Some such approach would lessen the peasant's negativism toward the city, a negativism which has been built up as a defense or as a result of genuine disapproval.

4. The statistics relative to the reading matter which comes into the village weekly show how little is being done effectively to influence the peasant by letters, journals, and other publications, although the literacy rate for males over fifteen years is 92.

[11] At first I had in mind the formulation of a contact Index such as Kulp used in his Chinese study, *Familism in South China*. I soon found that the various contacts were of varying intensity, concerned different types of people, and would, therefore, require separate weighting. My methods were not refined enough to make such weightings feasible. Furthermore, aside from the methodological interest, the value of such an index would be limited to the study of other Bulgarian villages in the same cultural setting.

467 ...acy can be . . . their constantly teaching the working class that the only correct road is the organization of patriotic socialist competitions and the fulfillment of the state economic plans."[*] And the Resolution of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party[*] added that "the most important role of the trade unions in a proletarian dictatorship is their organizational-economic and educational role—their role as schools of communism."

It seems obvious that trade unions in a democratic country and their Communist counterpart have absolutely nothing in common except their name. In fact, their nature, functions and aims are diametrically opposed to each other. In Bulgaria, they are channels of the Communist government and can be best compared with an economic police force, operating in factories and other places where the economic plans of the government are being implemented.

How, then, is it at all possible to speak about collective bargaining, when the two contracting parties are, in last analysis, representatives of one and the same Communist state authority? Still, the Bulgarian Communists persist in using the term "collective" or "individual labor contract,"[*] although in theory as well as in practice they exclude any conflict-of-interest matters from contractual regulation. Following the Soviet example, even wages and standards of output are excluded as subjects of bargaining and reserved for exclusive governmental regulation. Wages in Communist Bulgaria are determined on the basis of "labor norms"—that is, production quotas—prescribed by the government for each category of workers. If a worker is not able to fulfill his norm, he is paid according to the quantity and quality of the finished product. This piece-work system is the antipode of the system of hourly wages and was banished in 1905 as a remnant of Turkish feudalism.[*] Thus, the Bulgarian Government is absolute master in decreeing all important labor

465 656

466 656

Preustroyavaneto na Socializma v Nas (Sofia: 1951), p. 98, in Bulgarian.

[*] Cf. Pt. II, Ch. I and II of the Code of Labor.

[*] Indicative of Communist hypocrisy is the fact that, before 1905, the Bulgarian Communists were bitter opponents of the piece-work system, even for shoemakers, denouncing it as "the most detestable exploitation by the hyenas of private capitalism," Ivan Iliev, *Rabotnicheskio Syndicalno Dvizhenije v Bulgaria* (Sofia: 1927), p. 87, in Bulgarian. Communists everywhere, if out of power, violently oppose piece-work, yet introduce and hail it as "the most progressive achievement of the socialist state," once they take over.

466 656 conditions of the alleged individual or collective "agreements," without any negotiation on the part of the workers. Actually, the "labor contract" represents a model form, prepared in advance by the government, and submitted for signature to the labor arm of the government—the trade union committee—thus legally binding all workers to a document in the formulation of which they have not at all participated.

468 656 The secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party, Chankov, calls the labor contract an "economic-political document . . . a means for the mobilization of the working class for the fulfillment and overfulfillment of the plan" and frankly states that "the job of the trade unions with respect to the collective labor contracts by no means ends with the unions' task to sign the contracts. In fact, it starts only then. The most important aspect of their function is that, after the contracts have been signed, the trade unions exercise uninterrupted control and criticism of the administration of the contracts and mobilize the workers and employees for the contracts' fulfillment."[27]

It is obvious that those "contracts" represent nothing but a legally enforceable document with which the government imposes one-sided obligations upon the Bulgarian workers. The only consideration of the Communists in resorting to them seems to be their desire to give the outside world the impression of free labor relations within the Soviet orbit.

The provisions related to the settlement of labor disputes are also symptomatic in this respect. While using the term "labor disputes," the Bulgarian Communists not only shrink its subject matter to predominantly technical problems on the factory level, but also proclaim the supremacy of the executive over the judiciary in settling the disputes.[28] In practice, the dispute seldom leaves the first stage, the so-called conciliatory commission, composed of the persons who signed the collective agreements and reflecting the identical source of authority—the Communist government. It seldom happens, therefore, that the representatives of the government-employer and of the government-controlled committee are allowed

671

[27] Work cited at footnote 24, pp. 54-55.

[28] Cf. Pt. II, Ch. IX of the Code of Labor. Also, supplementary decrees in *Izvestiya na Presidiuma na Narodnoto Sobranje*, Nos. 38, May 9, 1952, and 47, June 3, 1952. Art. 143 of the Code, in particular, prohibits appeals to conciliation boards and courts for disputes involving disciplinary punishments or dismissal by the trade union or the governmental authori-

468 656 to disagree on the settlement of a labor dispute. If they should, the last word is explicitly reserved for the executive.

The collapse of collective bargaining and the regimentation of the labor force have restricted labor relations to technical questions and have transformed labor law into a means for enforcing governmental policy. The key institution of the Communist system vis-à-vis labor has become the so-called socialist discipline of labor.

466 656 "Socialist labor discipline" represents a system of rules affecting the conduct of the workers in any Communist enterprise, office or organization. Its aim is to increase production and productivity of labor without any particular regard to the real capacities of the national economy and of the labor force, including the individual worker. Within the limits of a governmentally recruited, directed and controlled labor force, "socialist labor discipline" embraces all regulations enacted by the Communist administration of every establishment which fix the specific obligations of the workers. In short, it is the regime under which the worker must perform his daily work, to which he is assigned and which he cannot leave.

It has been said that labor remuneration in Communist Bulgaria is based on the piece-work system. Accordingly, the primary requirement of the administration is that the worker fulfills his daily norm in order to get his full wage. But since norms are established by the State Institute for Labor Norms on the basis of the capacity of 5 to 10 per cent of the most productive workers, the remaining 90 to 95 per cent are driven to catch up by the rigorous labor discipline.[22]

466 671 The only possible way to reach the norm is to work more. That is why Article 43 of the Labor Code announces a "nonfixed working day" and Article 46(a) to (f) allows overtime work for a variety of purposes, in spite of general provisions to the contrary in Articles 39 and 43. The Decree for Overtime Work[23] dispels possible doubts by stating, in its Article 11, that "workers and employees cannot refuse . . . to perform overtime work. If they think that the imposed overtime work is unlawful, they

ties. In such cases the worker or employee may only appeal to higher administrative authorities.

[22] Cf. Leland Stowe, *Conquest by Terror* (New York: Random House, 1952), p. 135. While norms are constantly revised and increased, wages remain almost the same, so that, in 1951 alone, there was an automatic wage reduction of up to 25 per cent (p. 136).

[23] Text of decree in *Trud*, May 15, 1952.

175 In 1232, Kaloyan's successor, Ivan Asen, denounced
195 the union and severed all ties with the Roman Catholic Church.

During the nearly five centuries of Turkish rule (1393-1878) supreme authority over religious matters in the Bulgarian lands was vested in the Patriarch of Constantinople who was recognized very early (15th century) by the Turks as the religious head of all Christians in their empire. A Bulgarian Archbishopric at Ochrida was nevertheless allowed to function untill 1766 when the Greek Patriarch finally prevailed over the Turks to have this last vestige of Bulgarian past abolished.

[656] According to the general principle of the Ottoman law the non-Mohammedan communities enjoyed the jurisdiction not only in the religious matters but also in domestic relations and inheritance. Thus, all the disputes arising in this field among the Bulgarians were in fact judged in the last analysis by the dignitaries of the Patriarch of Constantinople who were predominantly Greek.

After the collapse of the State, the Bulgarian clergy was either banished or eliminated, thus opening a spiritual vacuum which was swiftly filled by the Patriarch's hierarchy, leaving only remote monasteries intact. From these very monasteries were to spring three centuries later (1762) the strong currents of a national Renaissance which finally culminated in religious and cultural emancipation of the Bulgarian nation from the Greek Patriarchate and Political liberation from the Ottoman Empire.

115
795

II. Establishment of a Bulgarian Exarchate and Relations with the Patriarchate of Constantinople

A. Under the Turkish Rule, 1870-1878

With the approval of the Moslem Sultans, the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople maintained a complete religious, and in many instances, cultural control over the areas inhabited by the Bulgarian people. A detailed apparatus was set up manned by appointees of the Patriarch exclusively. Treated as being the spoils of the office, the population was exposed to corruption and threat of Hellenization. Reaction was sporadic until 1762 when an obscure Bulgarian monk, Father Paisiy, published his History of the Bulgarian People and roving the country to let the people copy his book, aroused national pride and consciousness. From then on, the ideas of a separate Bulgarian political and cultural entity gave birth to a movement for national awakening and emancipation. Wisely, it first concentrated on the issue of Greek religious authority over Bulgarian lands versus a national Bulgarian church within the Turkish Empire. The issue came to a climax in the events of 1870-1872.

656
795
175

In 1870, the Turkish Government finally intervened in the religious dispute between the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Bulgarian population under its jurisdiction and issued an Imperial Decree (Firman) which recognized the validity of the Bulgarians' claim to an independent ecclesiastical authority and provided for the establishment of an autonomous Bulgarian Exarchate. In designating the area of jurisdiction of the new

656 795 175 Church, the Firman enumerated some of the Bulgarian-populated regions and provided for the holding of a plebiscite to determine the preference of the rest of the Bulgarian lands:

> If the population of any other places besides those enumerated above, and professing the Orthodox faith, should wish unanimously or at least by a two-thirds majority to be subject to the Bulgarian Exarchate, and if subsequent investigation should prove this to be so, their desire should be gratified (Article 10).*

795 In the following year, an all-Bulgarian church council convened at Constantinople to lay the foundations of a national Bulgarian church. The council met with stubborn opposition on the part of the Patriarchate which, claiming the status of an ecumenical church, refused to consent to the proposed creation of a church on the principle of nationality. The formula of the Ottoman Government in the Firman of 1870 whereby the Exarchate, though autonomous, was to recognize the primacy of the Patriarchate, would have avoided all the conflict if it had not been for the issue of the Exarch's residence. Supported by the Ottoman government, the Bulgarian council took the stand that the residence of the Exarch must be in Constantinople, capital of the Ottoman Empire and seat of the Patriarchate. The Patriarchate opposed the Exarch's having a seat in the same locality as the Patriarch himself.

---

* The full text of this important document is in Stoyan Protic, The Aspirations of Bulgaria (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton and Co., 1915), appendix.

B. The General Law of 1949

1. Summary and Analysis

671
669

The Communist Government promulgated, on March 1, 1949, a general law on the religious denominations in the country (Durzhaven Vestnik, No. 48, March 1, 1949). The full text of the law is given infra, (2). This law was promulgated while the trial of the Protestant pastors was in progress. Although it recognizes that the "Bulgarian Orthodox Church is the traditional religion of the Bulgarian people associated with its history" and suggest that "it may become the people's democratic church" (Section 3), the law introduces a uniform regime for all denominations, the over-all detailed control of which is vested in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. While it restates the constitutional provisions for freedom of conscience and religion and separation of church and state, the law recognizes only the exercise of "religious rituals" (Section 2) and makes no mention of activities for the propagation of the faith. To exist, a denomination requires recognition by the government granted through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Section 6) subject to arbitrary withdrawal. Recognition by the government of a denomination carries with it the status of a legal entity for its church.

●666
795

The governing bodies of the denominations are responsible before the government (Section 9) and must be composed of Bulgarian nationals (Section 10). Clergymen who "act against the democratic institutions of the state" may be

656
795

removed from office upon the request of the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Section 12).

In financial matters, the annual budgets of the denominations must be submitted to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; "when necessary, the state may subsidize them (the denominations)" (Section 13). All financial, hierarchical or personal relations with institutions abroad must be conducted through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Section 22 and 24).

The denominations are permitted to open schools for the training of ministers subject to control by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Section 14) but cannot maintain hospitals, orphanages and the like (Section 21). All messages, circular letters and publications issued by the denominations are subject to previous approval by the same Ministry which may stop such publications (Section 15).

An important feature of the new regime of denominational control is the registration of the governing bodies with the public authorities (Section 16). Furthermore, religious institutions established abroad cannot have subdivisions in the country; all such subdivisions are to be closed within one month from the promulgation of the law (Section 23). Within the same period the denominations must submit lists of their ministers to the Minister of Foreign Affairs which may request the dismissal of any one found objectionable (Section 31).

798
563

local population. The most active of those groups in that respect was the nationalistic organisation "National Defence", under the leadership of a reserve general. Now and then the members of that organisation staged a raid on some Jewish shops in Sofia where there lived no less than 20,000 Jews. But those sorties usually provoked by some discourteous act of the Jewish merchants, or of his employees, towards their Bulgarian customers, were ostracized by the government.

The situation changed abruptly at the beginning of World War II when the victories of the German Army in France made Hitler the virtual master of Europe. Bulgaria could not but take into account this change, the more so since her government was obviously inclined toward Germany. King Boris, whose power knew no limit, appointed then to the Ministry of Interior an attorney, none too intelligent, but an ardent Germanophile, who began to apply the national-socialist principles in the country and especially the theory of the purity of the race, which was claimed to be endanged in Bulgaria too. The national-socialists were shocked by the great liberty which the Jews enjoyed in Bulgaria, and openly began to talk of its suppression. Under German pressure, the Bulgarian government began to restrict its Jewish citizens. In December 1940 it sponsored in the legislature and the latter voted a law on the "Defence of the Nation", which deprived the Jewish citizens of their liberty and made them a lower class of citizens. The Jews were deprived of the right to serve in

656
798
563

656
798
563

government or public institutions and in the army; the right to own landed property and movie theaters, and the right to publish newspapers or to participate in their publication. The Jews were forbidden to marry Bulgarians or hire Bulgarian maids and the Jewish children were denied admission to Bulgarian schools. Jewish participation in commerce and industry was made proportional to the Jewish population. This was very difficult to establish and resulted, therefore, in numerous abuses. Provision was made for the forcible evacuation of the Jewish population from the capital to the country, so as to remove it from the sight of the Germans, who were preparing to enter Bulgaria. Jewish youngmen, who were forbidden to fulfill their military service together with their Bulgarian fellow citizens, were sent to serve in the labor detachments organized after the first world war when the subsequent peace treaty prohibited universal military training in Bulgaria, and the Bulgarians replaced it with the so-called labor service for the utilization of the conscripts for various public works, mainly road construction. This organization was maintained after the creation of a regular army and still exists. The fact that the Jews were drafted into the labor service did not indicate discrimination. Discrimination consisted of the creation of separate units for the Jews, which, of course, were treated more severely than the others.

Nobody was pleased by this law, inspired by the desire to disprove the reproaches which the Germans were making to the

government, and King Boris, after signing the law, preferred to suspend its application for six months with the hope that events would allow him to abandon it as an unnecessary measure against public opinion. The government confined itself to the mere registration of all Jewish property, movable and immovable. However, when the German Army entered Bulgaria in March 1941, and in April, crushed and occupied Yugoslavia and Greece, anti-Jewish legislation could no longer be deferred. Since King Boris disliked to sign outright discriminatory laws, a law was passed which authorized the Council of Ministers to issue decrees designed to settle the Jewish and related questions. Another law assessed a levy of 20 percent on all property of the Jews. A third law took away from the Jews the concessional pharmacies by obliging them to liquidate their business. (In Bulgaria pharmacies are opened only with a concession from the authorities which give these concessions under strict conditions, and for strictly limited sections of the community under state control.)

Acting on the authority of the powers given him by the legislature, the Council of Ministers established a special Commissariat for Jewish Affairs, which was given extensive powers, and which was placed under the direction of one of the most embittered persons in the country, acting in close cooperation with the German Legation in Sofia. It was this Commissariat which introduced the regime of limitations for the Jews who were required to sell all apartments and houses not used as personal residences; i.e., those which were rented, as well as the stock piles of various articles which they had

hoarded at the beginning of the war. The Jews were required to entrust the Bulgarian National Bank with all their valuables, stocks, bonds, and insurance policies, and to liquidate their participation in various commercial and industrial enterprises. Property owned by Bulgarian Jews living abroad was simply seized. In the field of liberal professions, only 53 Jews were admitted to free practice, of which 21 were attorneys, 21 physicians, 7 dentists, 3 chemists, and 1 architect; most of them were allowed to practice because they were either decorated war veterans or converts to Christianity. Special identification cards were issued to Jews, and in order to distinguish them from Bulgarians, they were forced to wear on the lapels of their coats a yellow star of David (foreign Jews and war veterans were to wear red circles). Jewish radio and telephone receivers were often abused by the pro-German part of the population; but they never lost the sympathy of the people who knew that all of this was due to the Germans.

656 ● 798 663

In Macedonia, which was occupied by Bulgarian troops but under German rule, the situation was slightly different. There were not many Jews there; they were assembled in one place, not in a concentration camp, as such a thing did not exist, but in a little town from where the Germans, one night in 1942, deported them without even informing the Bulgarian authorities, and transported them to Poland in closed freight cars.

The Germans could not treat the Bulgarian Jews in the

656
798
563

same way; but they were determined to deport them with the consent of the government. To this effect they received the cooperation of the Commissariat for Jewish Affairs and signed with the latter a formal agreement, which was ratified by the Council of Ministers, and according to which the government agreed to hand over to the German Government a certain number of Bulgarian Jews. This agreement was published by the press after a change in the government took place, but at the time it was kept strictly secret. The Jews, however, learned that they were to be sent to the German concentration camps and frenziedly began to look for protection. A spontaneous outburst of protests arose among the Bulgarian population, which had been badly rattled by the passage through the country of the freight trains loaded with the Macedonian Jews on its way to Romania. By the sickening scenes of the conditions of their transportation, the impression made by this action was shocking, and when it was learned that the same fate was reserved for the Bulgarian Jews, the whole country rose in a wave of protests which was expressed in thousands of letters addressed to the Court, imploring insistingly, and some even menacingly, the Head of the State to prevent this shame. The frothing created was such that the King saw himself obliged to emerge from his passiveness and to warn the Germans discreetly, but firmly, that he was not responsible for the order and the peace in the country if they continued this action. The Germans understood the warning and forsook the deportation of the Jews from Bulgaria. Instead, they

656
798
563

deported the Jews en masse from Sofia forcibly to two main Jewish centers in the country, namely, the towns of Pleven and Vratza. There the Jews lived unmolested until the Coup d'Etat of September 9, 1944, when the new government immediately restored them to their former status. Thus, the Bulgarian Jews, although they suffered material and moral damages, were saved from destruction, contrary to what happened in some of the other countries occupied by Germany.

The new government repealed all anti-Jewish legislation; all the seized or sequestered property was returned to the Jewish owners. A special decree-law was promulgated for "the settlement of the consequences of the revocation of anti-Jewish legislation affecting private property." The Jews were given full satisfaction. This was at the beginning. No laws or decrees were disclosed which would discriminate against the Jews or restrict the exercise of Jewish faith. However, the general program of nationalization of industry and commerce affected strongly the source of livelihood of many Jews in Bulgaria. Once the government had nationalized all the commerce and all the industry of the country, most of the Jews were deprived of the exercise of their trade. Since 1947, they have been emigrating en masse to Palestine. According to a letter from Israel, published in the organ of the Bulgarian National Committee "Free and Independent Bulgaria" of October 28, 1949, there already are 40,000 Bulgarian Jews in Israel, and there are only about 8,000 Jews left in Bulgaria, which are awaiting their turn to leave, with the exception of 2,000 to 3,000 at the most who are

563

exile to renunciation of the Bulgarian character of the school. With their few belongings that they managed to salvage, they sought refuge in Bulgaria. 795 797 563

The Uniate movement did not expand after the establishment of the Exarchate in 1871 and the creation of a Bulgarian State in 1879. The towns of Adrianople and Kukush were devastated and almost destroyed by the Balkan wars of 1912 and 1913. Turkey and Greece soon thereafter expelled most of the Bulgarian population of these regions. The Uniates among them were dispersed throughout Bulgaria and disappeared as an organized religious community. 795 175

Between the two world wars a powerful Catholic action was begun by Italy in the Balkans and particularly in Bulgaria. This action was carried out by a special religious organization called "Pro Oriente". It did not, however, pursue religious aims but pure Italian propaganda and there is beyond the scope of this report.

The foreign denominations, however, have even enjoyed the greatest freedom in Bulgaria, this freedom being consecrated by the Constitution itself (see supra) and were under the supervision of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs which also took care of the ecclesiastic affairs of the Bulgarian Church. The Constitution of 1879 had created in this Ministry a bureau in charge of the denominations. 656 ●

The need for a special law for the foreign denominations was not even felt under the pre-war regime. Such a law was not 671